

Serial No. 10/075,283

NIT-163-02

REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 10-18 are pending.

Claims 10 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Turtle, US 5,265,065 (Turtle). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

The invention claimed in claim 10 is a service for searching documents. According to the service, at least one document retrieved by a first search (e.g., keyword search) of a first database is input to the first database from which it came, to make a weighted term list reflecting the importance of the terms in the first document database. Then, the weighted term list is used as an input to perform a second search of a second document database. In addition to reflecting the importance of each term in the first document database, each term is weighted considering the importance thereof in both the first and second document databases, the weight being used to calculate the relevance of each document of the second document database.

The Office Action finds the input of the first document to the first database in Turtle at column 21, lines 54-61. This passage, however (actually part of claim 13 of the patent), discloses a database of phrases consisting of stemmed

Serial No. 10/075,283

NIT-163-02

terms derived from natural-language phrases, and a document database containing representations of the contents of the texts of a plurality of documents. There is no disclosure of inputting a document to the database, wherein the input document itself resulted from a search of the database.

Against the step of making a weighted term list, the Office Action cites Turtle at column 22, lines 16-36 (parts of claims 13 and 14), which disclose comparing search terms to the document database to identify the frequency of the search terms in the documents therein; assigning a statistical weight to the individual documents representing their probability of matching the search query; ranking the documents based on the statistical weight; identifying stemmed terms in the query that are shared by successive identified groups of stemmed terms; and identifying whether the number of stemmed terms in the successive groups is equal or unequal. However, there is no input of a document according to Turtle, and thus no weighted term list derived from an input document that reflects the importance of the terms in the document.

The Office Action also asserts Turtle's abstract as disclosing the claimed search of a second document database using the weighted term list as a search input. Turtle's abstract, however, notes a single search of a document network

Serial No. 10/075,283

NIT-163-02

using, as a search input, search query elements derived by matching individual words of a natural-language input query to a database to first remove stopwords, then to stem the remaining words after stopword removal, and finally to identify phrases in the resulting stemmed words to form the search query from the identified phrases and unidentified stemmed words. There is no second search of a second database using a weighted term list, and there is no weighted term list derived from a search using a document as an input, in Turtle.

Finally, the Office Action finds the claimed meaning of the weighted term list in Turtle at column 25, lines 16-34 (claim 26). Claim 26, however, discloses that the terms forming an input query may include one or more groups of terms forming citations having numerical terms; wherein each group of terms forming a citation is identified and replaced by a citation word comprising the numerical terms of the group and a predetermined word-level proximity number; the citation words are compared to representations of document contents to identify the frequency of occurrences of the citation words in the representations; and a statistical weight is assigned to each document concerning the probability that the document matches the search query. None of this suggests the weighting of list terms to reflect the importance of the terms in two

Serial No. 10/075,283

NIT-163-02

document databases, or the use of the weights to calculate the relevance of each document in a second database searched with the weighted term list as a search input.

Concerning claim 18, Turtle fails to disclose the claimed search of two document databases, in which a client transmits a set of documents in a first search input, receives a summary comprising only topic words related to the set of documents, sends a second search input corresponding to said summary reflecting a user's evaluation of the summary to search a second document database, and receives a search result from the search of the second document database; wherein said server storing the first document database produces the summary of topic words and transmits the summary to the client, and searches and transmits a set of documents having a high relevance to any desired summary sent by the client, to the client. Turtle's abstract and claims 13-14 (cited in the rejection) have been discussed above, and are clearly distinguishable. Further, Turtle's column 11, lines 24-42 disclose essentially the same subject matter as the abstract, and similarly fails to disclose the searching of two document databases as claimed in claim 18.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Serial No. 10/075,283

NIT-163-02

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1417.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Stanger  
Registration No. 32,846  
Attorney for Applicants

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone: (703) 684-1120  
Facsimile: (703) 684-1157  
Date: April 11, 2006